



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CORRESPONDENCE.

(*Apropos of AJPh. 37, 172 sq.*)

As an active contender (*quamvis andabatarum more*) for suffixation out of—but not exclusively out of—composition be it permitted me for the present to make a brief reply to the article of Professor Walter Petersen in *AJPh.* 37, 172 sq. As regards the spread of suffixes by irradiation there is no issue between Petersen and me, but he has taken upon himself the burden of denying, trifling exceptions apart, the possibility that suffixes—through the middle stage that I call confixes—have come from posteriora of composition. He further denies the availability of the Germanic confixes as illustrative of the process. This last proposition is entirely untenable.

In Wright's Old English Grammar, § 622, the suffix *-bāre* (: "Lat. *fer* in *lucifer* 'light-bearing'; originally a verbal adjective from *beran* 'to bear'") is documented by the following list of words and definitions, to which I have added approximate Latin synonyms:

appel-bāre 'apple-bearing' (**mālosus*, *malifer*; *pomosus*, *pomifer*); *ātor-bo* 'poisonous' (*venenosus*, *venenifer*); *cwealm-bo* 'deadly' (*exitiosus*, *mortifer*); *fever-bo* 'winged' (*plumosus*, *plumifer*); *fȳr-bo* 'fiery' (*flamosus*, *flamifer*); *gram-bo* 'passionate' (*furiosus*); *hāl-bo* 'wholesome' (—, *salutifer*); *horn-bo* 'horned' (**cornuosus*, *cornifer*); *lēoht-bo* 'bright, splendid' (*luminosus*): *lust-bo* 'desirable' (*quasi voluptuosus*); *mann-bo* 'producing men' (*quasi virosus*); *tungol-bo* 'starry' (**stellosus*, *stellifer*); *wāstm-bo* 'fruitful' (*fructuosus*); *wīg-bo* 'warlike' (*bellosus*).

With these Old English words before us, my contention is that, if we did not indisputably know the force and derivation of *obāre* and should agree to treat it as if it were a proethnic wordend, the greater number of active contemporary grammarians would declare *-bāre* a suffix so generalized as not to be susceptible to etymological interpretation, while Professor Petersen would have to go further and declare it impossible to conceive of "IE." *-bāre* ever having been a posterius.

By my Latin renderings in *-ōsus* I wish to call attention to Nichols's Yale dissertation (1914) on Semantic Variability. For *-ōsus* he sets down as many as 31 contextual nuances. Given a wide literary documentation for the OEng. adjectives

in *-bāre*, no doubt as fissipant nuances might, with some finesse, be translated into them. If we hearken to Wright's renderings, only two define *-bāre*, and ten several suffixes are displayed in his other definitions. A wider variability could hardly be desired even by one who would teach that suffixes could never have meant anything in particular. Yet any English scholar, confronted with this list, would probably feel the sense of 'bearing' in them all, for they are still clear and not obfuscated (*verdunkelte*) compounds. But all that is needed for their complete obfuscation is to transpose them, for the sake of argument, to the proethnic speech.

And the exhibit for *-bāre* is not isolated. Consider also the OEng. adjectives in *-fæst* (Wright, § 627), which I shall present with scant comment, chiefly by way of spacing:

"*-fæst*, same word (sic) as the adj. *fæst* 'fast, fixed, firm'. As *ærend-fæst* 'bound on an errand'; *ārfo-* 'virtuous'; *bīdfo* 'stationary'; *blād-fo* 'glorious'; *eorpfō* 'fixed in the earth'; *gieffō* 'gifted'; *hogfo* 'prudent'; *hūsfo* 'having a home'; *hygefo* 'wise'; *māgenfo* 'vigorous'; *sigefo* 'victorious'; *stedefo* 'steadfast'; *trēowfo* 'faithful'."

Of course we might render *ārfæst* and the rest by 'firm in honor', etc., and so maintain the actual sense of the posterius in each of the compounds, but Wright's renderings show that, judged through the medium of English definition, *-fæst* appears as truly a suffix as *-mant/vant* in the Sanskrit "possessives". Translation, it must not be forgotten, displays a vagueness and variety in the meaning of posteriora, confixes or suffixes, far in excess of their inherent vagueness or variability. For derivation, as well as for syntax, we must guard against being misled by the very finesse of our own renderings.

Not only in such larger groups of words are undeniable posteriora substantially as vague and variable as suffixes but, in proportion to their range, individual compounds reveal as wide a variability. Thus I noted in TAPA 44, 125 that Skr. *go-sakhi-*, literally 'cow-friend', but in one of its two occurrences = mixed with milk, is precisely equivalent to the "possessive" *go-mant* (see also Nichols, op. cit., 7 fn.). According to the current view,¹ Greek *ἀνδρά-ποδα* 'captives in war' is a definite irradiation, at only one remove, from *τετρα-ποδα*, in which case *-ποδα* never meant anything at all and 'captive'

¹ I would rather explain *ποδίξει* 'ties by the foot' from *ποδί* (loc.) + *ξει*: Skr. *dyāti* 'ties'; and *ἀνδρα-ποδίξει* (by back formation *ἀνδρά-ποδα*) as 'man-hobbles', cf. Eng. *hog-ties*. Pending a fuller treatment of the Homeric verb in *-ζω*, Professor Petersen will, I hope, be indulgent if I further analyze *πορί-ξει* 'gives to drink' (so L. and Sc.; quasi *biberdat*) as containing an infinitive **πορι* (cf. OBulg. *pi-ti* 'bibere', Av. *rāiti* 'dare', šiti 'habitare') + **dyeti* 'dat' (cf. AJPh. 37, 171, 29a).

was, as in *τετρά-ποδα* (!), a pure connotation. In *ὀρχί-πεδα* 'testiculi' (: *ὀρχις* 'testiculus') and in *λακκό-πεδον* 'scrotum' who can doubt that *-πεδον* is a posterius, but who can certainly define it?¹ In *ἀγχίμολον* 'prope' <prope-iens (cf. L. Meyer, *Hdbch.*, IV, 433) the posterius is almost reduced to a semantic zero. The fact that *-sakhi -ποδα -πεδον -μολον* did not spread by irradiation and so became suffixal is a mere accident. Semantically each of these posteriora is, within its range, as vague or variable as any suffix. In his Celtic Grammar (§ 362) Pedersen gives a list of twelve obfuscated posteriora; cf. also O'Connell's *Old Irish Grammar*, p. 40 (d).

Semantic variability and vagueness are not limited to word-ends. In no suffix has semantic variability gone farther than in the German word *zug*. In typical instances like *nova res* 'novelty' and *timidus animus* 'timidity' all the significance of *res* and *animus* can be obfuscated by translation.

In certain Greek periphrastic turns *βίη ἴς κῆρ μένος* (v. exx. ap. Seymour, *Homeric Language*, p. 21) are like the smile of Alice's vanishing Cheshire cat. Priora are also obfuscated (IF. 26, p. 33); and in the average use of our English words *atone alone*, or even *welcome*, neither priora nor posteriora ever rise to consciousness.

By disregarding the distinction between primary and secondary derivatives Professor Petersen darkens counsel. It is mere sophistication to impugn the semantic content of the larger suffixes because the suffixes *e/o i u* lack content. In truth, these declension exponents are mere deictics, *i* and *u* certainly identical with localia and *e/o* with instrumental and locative (cf. *AJPh.* 37, 167²; 170, § 28) and vocative exponents. This *e* meant 'there' (*là da*). For its vocative potency note a cry like English *you there*, varying with *there you*. Lat. *puer-e* is quasi 'garçon, là!', cf. the imperative *παῦ-ε* 'halte-là'.

Into Petersen's abstract and general arguments I shall not now further go. By way of antidote, for I also have my oracles,² readers might do well to consult Rozwadowski's *Wortbildung und Wortbedeutung* wherein it is ably contended that, psychologically considered, all noun suffixes must be regarded as confixes or posteriora; and even that, conceptually, every root noun is bipartite. R. expressly chronicles the multiple origin of *-er* in German nouns.

In his able dissertation on the *-ιον* diminutives in Greek Professor Petersen failed to score at least one neat point by

¹ If I am right in the belief that *πέδη* 'fetter' is from **πεδο-δη* 'foot-binder' (cf. *πέ[δο]-δίλον* 'sandal' with *ī < dī*), *-πεδον* may have meant 'binder' > 'bag'.

² I allude to the famous scene in the *Knights* of Aristophanes.

not perpending composition for the early words in *-dios*. For *διχθά-dios* we should certainly adduce *διχθά δεδαίταται* (a 23) and at least tentatively propose the definition 'bi-pertitus'. The independence of the adverb *μίνυνθα* 'paulum temporis' should also lead to the analysis of *μινυνθά-dios* 'short-lived', even if we cannot decide between (1) *-dios*: Av. *gaya-* 'life' and (2) *-dios*: IE. *DĀI* 'dividere', as found in Eng. *ti-me ti-de*. Pending a subsequent essay on *-dios* and the other *d* suffixes, I now premise that they are derivable from (1) *DŌ* 'dare' (cf. *κομι-δῆ* with Lat. *operam dare*), (2) *DĀI* 'dividere, partire' (3) *DĒI* 'vincere', (4) *gwi-* 'vivere' (Greek only). We are certainly to proceed from (3) *DĒI* in words like *ἀψι-δ-* 'mesh' and in names of apparel like *κνημι-δ-* 'greave', wherein *δ* is the weak-case stem-form of a root noun *DĒ* or *D-Ā* (cf. on *πέδη* above). The movable *δ* of Greek noun flexion originated from the interplay between pairs like **ἀψι-s*/tautological *ἀψι-δ-*, and acc. *κνᾶμιν* 'knee' (i. e. knee-covering, greave; cf. Eng. *leg* of trousers) interchanging with *κνᾶμι-δ-a* 'knee-binding' > 'greave'; cf. Skr. *ṛcya-dā*,¹ lit. 'antelope-binder' > 'pit for trapping elephants'. PW² also explains from the root *dēi* the adj. *-di-s* in *sadam-di-s* "für immer fesselnd,—bleibend,—dauernd" (cf. *sada-dīs* 'gewöhnlich'). This certainly gives us a clue to *ἄ-dios* (Hom. hymn) 'ever-lasting' and, with slight irradiation, to Hom. *κοῦρῖδιος* 'iuvenalis'. But in all these cases, as well as in *μινυνθάδιος* above, *-dios* may be referred to the sept of Eng. *time tide*: Skr. *dī-na-m*, day.²

With these three, or in Greek four, sources for *-d-* compounds the conditions were particularly favorable for vagueness in the eventual *d*-suffix. In Latin, we have *d* < *dh*, also. And much ought to be made of this fact. Prellwitz unnecessarily limited himself in his explanation of IE. (animal) names in *-bhos* to the sense of 'appearance, color'. But in the onomatopoeics in *-bhos* (see list, including *dundu-bhis* 'drum' and *φλόγα-φος* 'prattling', in Brugmann, Gr. 2, 1, 390) the sense of 'calling, speaking' is self-suggestive. In words like *κόλα-φος* 'fist-blow', *κρότα-φος* 'temple' (a 'throbbing') a believer in composition would look for a posterius cognate with O Bulg. *biti* 'ferire', and believe that the vagueness of the suffix *-bho* came from the fact that the original posterius *-bho* meant such different things as (1) color (2) calling (3) striking—but (2) may have come from (3).

¹ It is curious to contrast the hesitant analysis of Skr. *aṅga-da-m*, arm-band, in PW¹, with the confident explanation of *ṛcya-dā-* in PW².

² Further note (2) *DĒI* (to whirl, dance, rush), in the sept of *diuos*, *dieμαι*—perhaps in *ῥητ-διος*, which would then have meant 'facile vertens' at first; and (3) *DĒI* (to shine, show), in the kin of *δέαται*, and perhaps to be recognized in Homeric *ἀμφά-διος* × *κρυπτά-διος*. But the problem of *ἀμφά-διος* is complicated with the problem of *ἐκ-τάδ-ιος* (*-ταδ-*: Lat. *tend-it*).

At any time in the history of IE. speech or of any of its derivative tongues during the existence of the sept of Lat. *fāri* 'to speak' an onomatopoetic like *κουκού-φας* cuckoo (?) would have been inevitably analyzed as *cuccu-fans, an analysis that would have greatly facilitated the extension, under proper chronological conditions, of a *bh* suffix to bird names. Or, if *κουκούφα-s* is onomatopoetic through all its syllables, the root of *fā-ri* might even have been abstracted from it.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Nov. 18, 1916.

NOTE ON ARISTOPHANES AVES 1313.

In Ar. Av. 1313-14,

ταχὺ δὴ πολυάνορα τάνδε πόλιν
καλεῖ τις ἀνθρώπων,

Porson reads δὴ; the codices, δ' ἄν; G. Hermann (retaining *πτερῶν* in the antistrophe 1325), τὰν.

The MSS offer an example of ἄν + fut.; AN and ΔH are not infrequently interchanged, we are told,¹ but Porson's (on Eur. Hec. 1161) δὴ does not account for δ' unless it is the result of an early correction. One may recall however Xen. Cyn. 13. 7, *ῥάδιον γὰρ ἔσται αὐτοῖς ταχὺ μὴ ὀρθῶς μέμψασθαι*, and the emendation of G. Kaibel (Hermes XXV, 591 anm.), who suggested τὰ χύδην (scil. γεγραμμένα). A similar reading of the MSS in the Aristophanes passage is, I think, indicated,

τὰ χύδαν πολυάνορα τάνδε πόλιν
καλεῖ τις ἀνθρώπων,

your 'populous Pall Mall'—probably a comic allusion to a phrase of the day.

HENRY N. SANDERS.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

¹ S. C. G. 432 footn.